

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached drawing sheets add Figs. 7 and 8.

Attachments: New Sheets

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12 and 14 are amended, claim 17 is added, Figs. 7 and 8 are added, and the specification is amended to identify the new figures. Claim 12 is amended for improved clarity. Support for the other amended claims can be found, for example, in Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0030]-[0033] of the specification. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Duong and Tran in the May 19, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. §112 Rejection of Claims 2-5 and 12**

The Office Action rejects claims 2-5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

During the May 19 interview, the Examiners asserted that claims 2-4 (and 12) were not supported by the specification and figures. The Examiners asserted, for example, that claim 3 recites "a plurality of line forming regions...and both at least two electric power lines of the plurality of electric power lines and at least one scan line of the plurality of scan lines being formed in at least one line forming region" (emphasis added).

The Examiners indicated that neither the specification, nor the figures, support a line forming region having two power lines and a scan line. The Examiners indicated, for example, that Fig. 4 shows line forming region 51 having one power line and one scan line, and line forming region 41 having 3 power lines, but no line forming region having two power lines and a scan line.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiners are impermissibly narrowing the scope of support provided by the specification to the particular illustrative embodiments

shown in the figures. Paragraphs [0030]-[0033] of the specification fully support claims 2-4 and 12. Specifically, paragraph [0030], in conjunction with Fig. 3, explains that a basic premise of the invention is to ensure that the line forming regions, for example regions 31-34 in Fig. 3, all have the same width. The illustrative embodiment, shown in Fig. 3, groups a single power line (Vdd-R) in region 31, two data lines in region 32, two power lines in region 33, and a single data line in region 34.

However, paragraph [0033] explicitly states that this grouping is one illustrative. Paragraph [0033] further states that the invention is not limited to only two lines, or only the specifically discussed combinations of lines, in each region. As such, as long as the power, scan and data lines are combined in such a manner as to create uniform width in each line forming region, any combination of any number of various lines is supported.

Claims 2-4 and 12 are such combinations, which happen to use larger numbers of power and scan lines than shown in the illustrative embodiment of Figs. 3 and 4. Nevertheless, applicant respectfully submits the claims are fully supported by the specification. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## **II. §112 Rejection of Claim 14**

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that the claim term "the combination of the plurality of lines" is indefinite because it is unclear which lines the claim is referring to. Claim 14, as amended, recites that the "groupings of lines that constitute each line forming region are grouped in the same manner repeatedly in at least one of the row direction and the column direction." Applicant submits claim 14 is now sufficiently definite. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Objection to the Drawings**

The Office Action objects to the drawings for failing to identify all of the features of claims 2-5 and 12.

New Figs. 7 and 8 have been added. These figures, which are supported by paragraphs [0030]-[0033] (as discussed above), support claims 2-5 and 12. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **IV. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 1, 7-11 and 13-16**

Claims 1, 7-11 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent App. No. 2001/0048106 to Tanada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,825,820 to Yamazaki et al ("Yamazaki"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 11, as amended, recite that the electro-optical device has "a first line forming region having at least two electric power lines; and a second line forming region having at least one data line selected from a plurality of data lines, wherein the first and the second line forming regions are either both in the column direction or both in the row direction." Applicant respectfully asserts Tanada and Yamazaki do not disclose these features. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **V. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 2-5 and 12**

Claims 2, 4-5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0076046 to Komiya et al ("Komiya") in view of Yamazaki. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,633,135 to Nara et al ("Nara") in view of Yamazaki. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 12, as amended, recite that at least one line forming region will contain "lines chosen from at least two of the following groups: (1) at least two electric power lines of the plurality of electric power lines with different widths, (2) at least one scan line of the plurality of scan lines, and (3) at least one data line of the plurality of data lines." Likewise,

claim 3 recites that the line forming regions contains both two electric power lines and a scan line. The current §103(a) rejections do not address where the applied references disclose these features. Rather, the current rejections are substantively identical to the rejections of these claims from the previous Office Action. Applicant presumes the Office Action chose to give no patentable weight to the above features, in light of the §112 rejection.

However, these features are supported by the specification, as discussed above. Therefore, because the Office Action does not address where these features are disclosed in the applied references, the Office Action fails to present a prima facie case that the applied references disclose or suggest every feature of claims 2-4 and 12. As such, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-4 and 12, and claim 5 depending therefrom, is respectfully requested.

#### **VI. Conclusion**

Applicants also submit claim 17 is in condition for allowance, for both the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter is recites.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Moshe K. Wilensky  
Registration No. 56,263

JAO:MKW/jfb

Attachments:

Amendment Transmittal  
Figs. 7 and 8

Date: June 19, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---